DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 437 CE 028 189

AUTHOR Tesolowski, Dennis G.; Wichowski, Chester P.
TITLE Florida Public Occupational Education Admission Standards and Practices Study.
SPONS AGENCY Florida State Advisory Council on Vocational and Technical Education, Tallahassee.; Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee.; Florida State Dept. of Labor and Employment Security, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; *Admission (School); *Admission Criteria; *Affirmative Action; Analysis of Variance; Community Colleges; Competitive Selection; Educational Opportunities; Employment Programs; *Equal Education; Federal Programs; Justice; Nondiscriminatory Education; Open Enrollment; Postsecondary Education; Selective Admission; Sex Fairness; Technical Education; Two Year Colleges; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Florida

ABSTRACT

A two-phase study was conducted in order (1) to develop a profile of admission standards and practices which were being used by forty public occupational education programs in Florida; and (2) to enhance the state-of-the-art encompassing admission procedures by identifying the degree of equity associated with 19 admission standards as perceived by 173 randomly selected persons who had a relationship with occupational education or advocacy groups. The research design incorporated analysis of variance (ANOVA) on repeated measures and a rank ordering procedure to determine if there was a difference in the degree of equity associated with the 19 items and to ascertain which admission practices were the most and least equitable. A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) procedure was applied to compare groups' degree of equity ratings. Results in phase 1 of the study identified eleven admission standards or practices which were being used to admit students to public occupational education programs. Phase 2 of the investigation identified four admission practices which were consistently rated as having the greatest degree of equity and four with the least degree of equity. Recommendations were made that would assure that admission procedures would be in accordance with U.S. Office of Civil Rights Final Guidelines. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199437

The Florida Public Occupational Education Admission Standards and Practices Study

Dennis G. Tesolowski

Florida International University

Chester P. Wichowski

Rutgers University

CE028189

A Paper Presented

at the

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

1981 ANNUAL MEETING

Los Angeles, California April 13-17, 1981

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dennis G. Tesolowski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

Forty public occupational education institutions were randomly surveyed to ascertain admission standards and practices that were currently in use in Florida. Additionally, a predetermined set of 19 admission criteria, including the standards identified in the initial survey, were rated by 173 randomly selected individuals associated with occupational education or advocacy groups in Florida to determine their degree of equity. An ANOVA procedure indicated significant differences ($p \leq .05$) between the total populations' ratings on the 19 criteria. Group differences did not occur on a MANOVA test. Admission practices with the highest and lowest degree of equity were identified through a rank ordering process.

The Florida Public Occupational Education Admission Standards and Practices Study*

In recent years educational theorists, practitioners and critics have been motivated by federal legislation and resulting litigation to give a high priority to discrimination issues in the educational arena. Concerns have been continually expressed regarding the equity of admissions to public occupational education programs throughout the United States.

The Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education (1962) cited a severe lack of nondirective guidance, occupational information, and relevant programming for individuals with special needs. In commenting on the lack of vocational special needs programs the Panel indicated that there was overwhelming evidence that the problems which make up the complex are old, traditional problems and that occupational education has been largely for selected students. Obviously the Panel was calling for a change in established procedures of selecting vocational education students.

Concerns about the availability of vocational education programs for all of the United States' citizenry were recently reiterated by the American Vocational Association's (AVA) Assembly of Delegates. Two of the 16 resolutions which were approved by the Assembly at its 1980 session explicitly

---

*The project herein was conducted for the Florida State Advisory Council on Vocational and Technical Education pursuant to a grant administered by the Florida Department of Education and the Division of Employment and Training. Contractors undertaking such projects are encouraged to express freely their professional judgments in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Florida Department of Education, the Florida State Advisory Council, or the Division of Employment and Training.

addressed the issue of equity. Resolution number one declared the purpose of vocational education and established equal access and equality of opportunity as the second and third priorities for the forthcoming federal vocational education legislation. The fourth resolution dealt with informing the public about vocational education and clearly described the AVA's valid concern about equality of access:

> Be it Resolved, that the AVA support and work toward providing equal access to all vocational education programs; and Be it Further Resolved, that the AVA propose to Congress that one priority for federal vocational education funds be that of assisting local and state education agencies and institutions to better provide those special services that will enhance the entry into and the successful completion of vocational education by special populations. ("Resolutions '80," 1981, p. 12)

A continuum of legislation, implemented through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor, culminated in the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) Final Guidelines on admission practices utilized by public institutions delivering occupational education. These regulations, which were published on March 21, 1979, represent a capstone to the momentum created by the human rights movement of the 1960's. Their primary purpose was to rapidly change vocational guidance practices which have evolved since the early 1900's (Kapes & Greenwood, 1979). The guidelines were derived from and provide supplementary guidance to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352), Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318), and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-112).

Essentially the OCR guidelines were created to eliminate discrimination and denial of services in vocational education programs on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, and handicap. Subsequently, institutions offering public occupational education programs must be concerned with the utilization of geographic boundaries, admissions limited to a fixed number of students from each sending school or institution in a service area or any selection criteria that have the effect of disproportionately excluding persons in special populations.

The OCR regulations stated that academic performance, record of disciplinary infractions, counselors' approval, teachers' recommendations, interest inventories, high school diplomas, standardized tests and prerequisite courses should only be used if they do not disproportionately exclude students. This regulation can only be disallowed if such criteria have been validated as essential to participation in a given program and alternative equally valid criteria that do not have such disproportionate adverse effects are unavailable. Furthermore, national origin minority students with limited English language skills and handicapped students may not be denied access to vocational programs because of the need for related services or auxiliary aids.

The purpose of this investigation was two-fold: Phase one reviewed admission standards, criteria and practices used in the delivery of public occupational education programs. Phase two ascertained the degree of equity of admission standards relevant to public occupational education programs.

Method

Sample

Phase I. Populations surveyed in phase one as well as phase two of this investigation are presented in Table 1. The randomly selected sample

surveyed in phase one included two area vocational technical education centers (AVTC's), two community colleges (CC), and four programs administered by prime sponsors of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)

Insert Table 1 about here

in each of Florida's five regional areas. Thirty-seven of forty (85%) institutions or occupational service delivery systems responded to a structured, open-ended questionnaire.

Phase II. The Subjects surveyed in phase two of the investigation initially included 440 randomly selected individuals associated with occupational education or advocacy groups in Florida. Attrition due to nondeliverable (address unknown or incorrect address) opinionnaires resulted in an adjusted sample size of 377 with a usable return of 173 or 45.89%. Persons surveyed essentially represented. (1) AVTC administrators, counselors and instructors; (2) community college administrators, counselors and instructors of non-degree occupational education programs; (3) CETA program administrators and instructors; (4) advisory council members for occupational education programs; and, (5) advocacy group members. Advocacy groups selected for this study included organizations concerned with blacks, hispanics, women, handicapped, and disadvantaged individuals.

Instrumentation

Phase I. A one-page questionnaire was specifically designed to aid in the collection of data on phase one of the study. Items on the questionnaire requested each institution or occupational service delivery system to identify a contact person and to submit a listing of both generic and program specific admission standards which they were currently utilizing. Information

submitted by respondents to this questionnaire was synthesized and compiled into a single inclusive list. This compilation included eleven primary admission standards or practices which are presented in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Phase II. An opinionnaire was developed for phase two of this investigation which would elicit individuals' reactions, perceptions or attitudes toward admission standards and practices which were being or could be utilized by public occupational education programs. Subsequently, a three part research instrument entitled the Public Occupational Education Admission Equity Opinionnaire (POEAEO) was produced. Part A was developed to collect demographic data. Information resulting from this section categorized respondents' institutional or group affiliation (A1) as well as their professional title or role category (A2). Parts B and C were respectively designed to ascertain the degree of equity associated with 19 admission standards and practices used in initial institutional or program area admission (Part B) and for admission of students who have been placed on waiting lists for oversubscribed programs (Part C).

Items included on the POEAEO (Table 3) evolved from data collected in phase one of this investigation (these items are designated with asterisks on Table 3), as well as through selected findings identified in a comprehensive review of related literature. Of the 19 identical standards listed in Parts B and C of the opinionnaire, 11 items were derived from phase one and 8

Insert Table 3 about here

---

were synthesized through the review of the literature.

A 5-point Likert-type rating scale was utilized with each of the 19 items on Part B (initial or program area admission) and Part C (admitted students who are on waiting lists) to determine the degree of equity associated with them. A rating of 5 represented the highest degree of equity and a rating of 1 represented the lowest degree of equity.

Procedure

Phase I. A one-page questionnaire was developed for phase one which was mailed along with a transmittal letter to AVTC, community college and CETA program administrators. A degree of confusion was encountered in the acquisition of information from CETA program administrators which required follow-up telephone conversations and a second mailing. Ultimately 11 admission standards or practices were compiled through the synthesis of information which resulted from the questionnaire.

Responses were categorically tallied on the basis of whether the three service delivery systems utilized the 11 identified admission standards and practices for initial institutional or specific program area admittance. In addition, responses were combined and tallied on the basis of both institutional and program area standards added together. Frequencies or percentages were calculated which represented the number of times a specific standard was identified in comparison to the total number of standards which were being used by a service delivery system. The total number of times each admission standard or practice was identified and the frequency of its occurrence are listed in Table 2.

Phase II. The Public Occupational Education Admission Equity Opinionnaire (POEAEO) was responded to by 173 randomly selected individuals.

Persons surveyed were categorically grouped by institution or affiliation (A1) and title or role category (A2). Groups in A1 included AVTC's, community colleges, CETA programs, advisory councils and advocacy groups. Administrators, counselors and instructors were included in A2.

Data gathered from the returned opinionnaires was transferred to optical scan sheets, which were then used to punch computer cards for data file entry. Statistical analyses utilized in this phase of the investigation involved descriptive statistics, analysis of variance (ANOVA) on repeated measures, one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), a Kendall rank order correlational procedure, and a specially designed program which sorted and listed items by groups as well as the total population on the basis of frequencies and means.

Means and standard deviations were obtained for all items on Parts B and C of the POEAEO for the total population and each group by institution or affiliation (A1) and title or category (A2). This data is included in its entirety for the total population on Table 3. However, only the range of means, which represents the high and low items, have been included for the groups in A1 and A2 on Table 4.

Insert Table 4 about here

Analysis of variance on repeated measures was applied to the data for the total population to determine if there were significant differences ($p \leq .05$) in the degree of equity ratings for the 19 standards or practices used for initial or program area admission (Part B) and for admitted students who are on waiting lists (Part C). This analysis was conducted separately for the total population by institution or affiliation (A1) and title or role category (A2). Results of the ANOVA procedure for Parts B and C are

presented in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 about here

A MANOVA procedure was used to analyze the data to determine if there were group differences at the .05 level on the degree of equity ratings. This analysis procedure was applied separately for the groups in A1 and A2. Groups in A2 (title or role category) did not differ significantly in their equity ratings on the standards in Parts B or C of the opinionnaire.

The degree of relationship between initial or program area admission (Part B) and admission from a waiting list (Part C) was ascertained by applying a Kendall rank order correlational procedure to the responses from the total population. The correlation between the rank order of the means was .9267.

The final analysis sorted and separately listed the 19 standards in Parts B and C of the opinionnaire for each group in A1 and A2 as well as for the total population on the basis of frequencies and means. The degree of equity associated with individual items was determined by the frequency of ratings in the (4 and 5) or (1 and 2) categories on the 5-point Likert-type scale. These categories of ratings were selected since they reflected a relatively high degree or low degree of equity. Items identified with three asterisks on Table 3 represent 20% of the standards in Parts B and C which had the greatest or least degree of equity associated with them.

For example, item number 7 (A lottery selection system for all admissions) was rated in the lower 20% or the low degree of equity category (ratings of 1 or 2) by all nine categorical groups. In other words, this item was consistently rated 1 or 2 by the total population, AVTC's, CETA

programs, community colleges, advisory councils, advocacy groups, administrators, counselors and instructors.

Results and Discussion

The two central purposes stated in the introduction provided the impetus for analysis and reporting of results. These two major objectives, in sum, related to determining: (1) admission standards, criteria and practices used in the delivery of public occupational education programs and (2) the degree of equity associated with admission standards relevant to public occupational education programs. An increased understanding of this latter objective was acquired by determining if there were differences in the total populations' degree of equity ratings on the 19 admission standards included on the Public Occupational Education Admission Equity Opinionnaire (POEAEO) and if the groups within the total population differed in their degree of equity ratings.

Phase I

Findings of the statewide survey identified 11 admission standards or practices which were being used by AVTC's, community colleges and CETA programs. As indicated in Table 2, five admission standards listed most frequently included: Ability to meet minimal physical performance levels or standards necessary to an occupational license or employment, individual interviews by counselors and/or instructors, previous overall grade point average, standardized achievement test scores, and minimum age requirements necessary to qualify for an occupational license or employment.

Phase II

Overall differences in degree of equity ratings. Significant differences occurred in the degree of equity ratings for the total population on the 19

admission standards (Table 5) which were included on Part B (initial institutional or program area admission) and Part C (admitted students whose names have been placed on waiting lists) of the POEAEO. However, interaction between groups in A1 (institution or affiliation) and the items was identified on both Part B and Part C. Therefore, the main effects or significant differences are not necessarily equally true for all groups.

Group differences in degree of equity ratings. Differences between groups by title or role category (A2) did not occur on Parts B or C of the Public Occupational Education Admission Equity Opinionnaire. However, groups in A1 (institution or affiliation) differed significantly on their equity ratings for the 19 standards on Parts B and C. Respectively, administrators, counselors and instructors expressed differences in their degree of equity ratings on items 6, 7, 10, 13, 18 and 19 and community colleges, AVTC's, CETA programs, advisory councils and advocacy groups did not tend to agree in their degree of equity ratings on items 10, 14, 17, 18 and 19.

Admission standards with the highest degree of equity. Four items were consistently rated as having a high degree of equity on Parts B and C of the POEAEO. A fifth item was tied for the fourth position, which represented the upper 20% on Part C.

3. Individual interviews by counselors and/or instructors.

10. The first students to apply will be the first students admitted.

17. Ability to meet minimal physical performance levels or standards necessary to an occupational license or employment.

18. Minimum age requirements necessary to qualify for an occupational license or employment.

Rated High on Part C only:

1. Standardized aptitude test scores.

Admission standards with the lowest degree of equity. Four items were most frequently rated as having a low degree of equity on Parts B and C of the opinionnaire. Two additional items were tied for the fourth position representing the lower 20% on Part B.

5. Existing geographic boundaries and/or sending school boundaries.

6. Admission of an equal number of students from all sending schools.

7. A lottery selection system for all admissions.

9. Admission of a proportional number of students based on the size of each sending school's student population.

Rated low on Part B only:

12. Admission preference given to low enrollment program areas.

19. Standardized personality test scores.

Utilization of Admission Standards which Have a High or Low Degree of Equity

Results of phase one of this study identified 11 admission standards that were being used to determine which students would be allowed to enter public occupational education programs. These criteria were included on the research instrument which was used in phase two of this investigation.

After phase two was completed, it became evident that one of the items which was identified as having a high degree of equity was not included in the 11 standards that were being used to select students. Item 10 (The first students to apply will be the first students admitted.) was not identified by any of the programs surveyed in phase one as a current admission practice. It is interesting that item 10 was a distant third to items 3 (Individual interviews by counselors and/or instructors) and 17 (Ability to meet minimal physical performance levels or standards necessary to an occupational license or employment.) on both Parts B and C of the opinionnaire. Community colleges, advisory councils, and advocacy groups

did not rate item 10 as having a high degree of equity on either Part B or Part C and CETA programs did not give this item a high rating on Part C (admitted students who are on waiting lists).

The conceptual foundation underlying the first come first served criteria is based upon the principle of intent and serves as a courtesy in most social systems. For example, the concept of seniority in the work environment and the timeliness of interest are basic to the legal structure of this country as well as an everyday consideration afforded to all individuals. This same concept did not, however, receive the highest equity rating.

One of the four factors which had a low degree of equity as a result of the analyses on phase two was identified as currently being in practice on phase one. This item was number 5 (Existing geographic boundaries.). Community colleges was the only group which did not rate item 5 as having a low degree of equity on either Part B or Part C of the opinionnaire. This finding correlated well with the reported use of existing geographic boundaries and/or sending school boundaries by community colleges in phase one. Community colleges classified as AVTC's have apparently developed their admission standards and practices around preexisting geographic or sending school boundaries.

Item 12 (Admission preference given to low enrollment program areas.) was determined to have a low degree of equity on Part B of the opinionnaire, although it was also identified as being currently in practice on phase one of the investigatiion. The appearance of this item in the low degree of equity category is not surprising since students should not be placed in low enrollment programs simply because of a need to increase program participants.

This practice was reported by one AVTC during the first phase of this study. As evidenced by the ratings of instructors, counselors, community colleges, and advocacy groups this practice is low in its degree of equity and obviously is a procedure that should not occur merely to generate additional full-time equivalents (FTE's) for funding purposes.

Influences to the Selection Process

Data included in Table 3 indicates that individual interviews by counselors and/or instructors (item 3) as well as students' abilities to meet minimal physical performance levels or standards necessary to an occupational license or employment (item 17) are the selection practices with the highest degree of equity. Consensus of all groups denotes that instructors and/or counselors should be involved in making admission decisions based on the outcome of individual interviews.

Further review of the data suggests that different reasons may exist for this preference by the various groups within the total population. Respondents from advocacy groups and CETA programs associated a relatively high degree of equity with item 15 (admission preference). It could be surmised that this reflects a desire to show special consideration for women, minority group members, and handicapped or disadvantaged students during the interview process.

Ratings by instructors and counselors seemed to reveal a preference for the individual interview as a follow-up activity to standardized test results. These two groups associated a high degree of equity with the use of results on standardized work samples and performance tests (item 16). A potential hazzard may exist, however, in this practice if instructors or counselors are not professionally trained to interpret test results.

Respondents representing instructors and community colleges gave item 13 (Degree of proficiency in the English language.) a relatively high degree of equity rating. It may be speculated that instructors, who are not bilingual, would have anxiety and difficulty in conducting an interview with prospective students who are not fluent in the English language.

Data included in Table 3 indicates that a lottery system for all admissions (item 7) is the least desirable admission practice. It was unamimous among all groups that this practice should be classified in the grouping of items with the lowest degree of equity.

When the low degree of equity associated with the lottery system is contrasted with the high degree of equity of individual interviews it becomes apparent that program leaders are not willing to allow pure chance to be the sole influence on determining which students might be admitted to their programs. Additional factors impacting on this issue are program funding patterns, accountability and program evaluation. As these administrative concerns are applied to individual program areas in an operating educational delivery system, the importance of graduating well-trained students becomes critical in maintaining a quality image and program vitality. Consequently, program evaluation is primarily concerned with positive benefit outcomes or the successful placement of graduates on the job. Evaluation systems are not sensitive enough to detect positive developmental changes of individual students. Nor do funding sources appear to encourage the measurement of individuals' developmental growth patterns. This dilemma seems to influence the decision-making process that instructors, counselors, and administrators exercise when selecting students.

Relationship of the Admission Standards in Phases I and II of this Investigation to the Office of Civil Rights Guidelines

Admission standards currently in practice. Composite findings of phase one of this study identified several admission standards that may be in potential conflict with the OCR regulations. Of the five admission standards (2,3,4,10 and 11) which were reported as most frequently used, previous overall grade point average (2), individual interviews by counselors and/or instructors (3), and standardized achievement test scores (4) appear to present the greatest potential conflict. Therefore, these three admission standards may require further review and validation by institutions delivering public occupational education programs.

Occupational programs using standardized tests and overall grade point averages for admission must accept the responsibility for providing factual data to substantiate the validity of this practice as it relates to the occupational success of persons employed in the areas of student interest. Criteria included in the individual interview and ultimate decision-making process need to be critically examined since the OCR regulations banned nebulous admissions criteria which may disproportionately exclude special interest groups.

The Office of Civil Rights did not specifically address the use of minimal physical performance levels or standards (10) and minimum age requirements (11) as they relate to admission practices. Minimal physical performance standards could possibly disproportionately exclude women or handicapped individuals from entry to an occupational program. However, if these standards were derived from a valid job analysis and if no other valid criteria that did not have a disproportionate adverse effect were available, it would be proper to continue using such practices. Standards of minimal physical performance appear to be excellent admission standards if they accurately represent the occupation for which the programs enrollees are being trained and if percise measurements have been made for comparison.

Minimum age and physical requirements have statutory and regulatory foundations. Adjustments to these practices may require legislative or agency action at the state or federal levels.

Additionally, respondents representing AVTC's and community colleges indicated that they were using standardized aptitude test scores (1), existing geographic boundaries and/or sending school boundaries (5), and recommendations by others (6) as admission standards. These practices should also be carefully examined by local institutions and appropriate state agencies to insure that they do not disproportionately exclude special interest groups.

Factors with a high degree of equity. Respondents to the POEAEO rated individual interviews by counselors and/or instructors (3), the first students to apply will be the first students admitted (10), ability to meet minimal physical performance levels or standards necessary to an occupational license or employment (17), and minimum age requirements necessary to qualify for an occupational license or employment (18) as the most equitable admission standards.

As previously mentioned, item 10 was the only one of these standards which was not identified in phase one of this investigation. The relationship of items 3, 17, and 18 to the Office of Civil Rights guidelines was presented in the last section of this report. Regarding item 10 (The first students to apply will be the first students admitted.), it appears that the OCR regulations endorse this admission standard as a highly objective criterion which could only exclude a disproportionate number of a special interest population on a chance basis. This practice may therefore be one of the most equitable methods for processing students seeking initial admission and for admitting students on waiting lists for oversubscribed programs.

Degree of equity ratings placed item 10 in a distant third position to items 3 and 17. Consequently, it may be speculated that the respondents to this survey intended to allow students into programs on a first come first served basis only after they had the initial opportunity to accept or reject them based on the application of the criteria in factors 3 and 17. The criteria used in the individual interview are perhaps the most critical elements with which the Office of Civil Rights would be concerned.

Factors with a low degree of equity. Respondents to this opinionnaire indicated that existing geographic boundaries and/or sending school boundaries (5), admission of an equal number of students from all sending schools (6), a lottery selection system for all admissions (7), admission of a proportional number of students based on the size of each sending school's student population (9), admission preference given to low enrollment program areas (12) (Part B only), and standardized personality test scores (19) (Part B only) were the least equitable admission standards. This low degree of equity associated with items 5, 6 and 9 seems to indicate that the respondents agree with the spirit of the sections in the Office of Civil Rights guidelines on geographic and sending school boundaries. However, these feelings had not apparently affected the admission standards that were being practiced by several AVTC's and community colleges that reported using existing geographic boundaries and/or sending school boundaries at the time phase one of this investigation was conducted.

The low degree of equity associated with a lottery selection system for all admissions (7), is somewhat difficult to interpret. Based on an understanding of the OCR guidelines by the investigators of this study it seems likely that this admission practice would be considered as an

objective criterion, which would not systematically exclude a disproportionate number of any special interest group. A well-documented lottery selection system would seem to be an equitable method of handling initial program entry and entry from a waiting list for oversubscribed programs, if the applicants had been previously screened using objective criteria prior to a published cut-off date. It may be speculated that the respondents to this survey were not confident in this approach due to its limited application to school admission practices and its total by chance implications.

Summary and Recommendations

This two-phrase investigation was undertaken in an attempt to develop a profile of admission standards and practices which were currently being utilized by public occupational education programs in Florida. Secondly, the study was conducted to enhance the state-of-the-art encompassing admission procedures by identifying the degree of equity associated with 19 admission standards as perceived by individuals who had a relationship with occupational education or advocacy groups. The research design incorporated ANOVA on repeated measures and a rank ordering procedure to determine if there was a difference in the degree of equity associated with the 19 items and to ascertain which admission practices were the most and least equitable. A one-way MANOVA procedure was applied to compare groups' degree of equity ratings.

Results on phase one of this study identified 11 admission standards or practices which were being used to admit students to public occupational education programs. Five of these 11 standards were singled out due to their frequency of utilization. Phase two of the investigation served to identify four admission practices which were consistently rated as having the greatest degree of equity and four with the least degree of equity.

Based upon the findings of this study, the following recommendations are warranted:

1. That surveys of oversubscribed programs be conducted in order to assess whether or not current admission standards and policies exist and to determine whether or not the admission practices are in compliance with the Office of Civil Rights Final Guidelines.

2. That public documents be developed and disseminated nationally and statewide which expand upon the critical elements of the Office of Civil Rights Final Guidelines.

3. That training programs for vocational counselors, administrators, and instructors be developed and offered as necessary to aid in the implementation of the OCR Final Guidelines as they apply to local admission practices.

4. That a student selection model be developed for each oversubscribed vocational education programmatic area offered by community colleges and AVTC's on a statewide basis. These models could then be utilized to develop individualized local programmatic student selection plans and policies.

5. That objective interview guidelines be developed for use by vocational instructors, counselors and administrators in institutional and specific programmatic area admission practices. These guidelines must be validated in terms of their ability to predict which potential students will or will not be successful in the program and on the job.

6. That minimal physical performance levels or standards for entry into specific occupational training programs be established. These standards must be validated as a predictive measure of satisfactory physical ability for success in the program and employment upon program completion.

7. That a model set of guidelines be established to enhance the ability of occupational education programs to formulate and make public admission practices which are used for initial institutional admittance and admission to oversubscribed programs.

References

Kapes, J.T., & Greenwood, K.L. Walking the tightrope of student selection. Voc Ed, 1979, 54 (7), 24-27.

Office of Civil Rights. Vocational education programs--Guidelines for eliminating discrimination and denial of services on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, and handicap, Federal Register, March 21, 1979, 44 (56). Washington: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (ED 170 981)

Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. Education for a changing world of work. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962

Public Law 88-352. Civil Rights Act of 1964. July 2, 1964.

Public Law 92-318. Education Amendments of 1972 (Title IX-Prohibition of Sex Discrimination, Sec. 901). June 23, 1972.

Public Law 93-112. Rehabilitation Act of 1973. September 26, 1973.

Resolutions '80. Update, January/February, 1981, p. 12.

Table 1

Sample Surveyed in Phases I and II of the Investigation

Phase I

	Initial Mailing	Number Returned	*Second Mailing	Number Returned	Total Number Returned	Total Percent Returned
AVTC Directors	10	8	NA	NA	8	80.00%
Community College Administrators	10	9	NA	NA	9	90.00%
CETA Program Directors	20	10	7	7	17	85.00%
TOTALS	40	27	7	7	34	85.00%

Phase II

Category by Institution or Affiliation	Number Surveyed	Number of Returned as Non-Deliverable	**Number Included in Adjusted Survey	***Number of Usable Returns	Percent of Usable Returns
AVTC	140	7	133	118	88.72%
CETA	75	5	70	8	11.43%
Community College	75	11	64	18	28.13%
Advisory Council	75	26	49	19	38.77%
Advocacy Groups	75	14	61	10	16.39%
TOTALS	440	63	377	173	45.89%

* Preceded by follow-up telephone inquiries. **This number was obtained by subtracting the number of persons initially surveyed from the number of surveys returned by the Post Office as non-deliverable, address unknown or incorrect address. ***There were 4 opinionnaires returned which were not complete.

Table 2

Frequency and Combined Frequency of Admission Standards in Use by Institutions and Program Areas Responding to Phase I of the Investigation

	Institutional		Program Area*		Combined**	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Standardized aptitude test scores.	1	3.2%	4	7.1%	5	5.7%
2. Previous overall grade point average.	7	22.6%	5	8.9%	12	13.8%
3. Individual interviews by counselors and/or instructors.	2	6.5%	15	26.8%	17	19.6%
4. Standardized achievement test scores.	8	25.8%	3	5.4%	11	12.6%
5. Existing geographic boundaries and/or sending school boundaries.	6	19.4%	-	-	6	6.9%
6. Recommendations by others.	-	-	5	8.9%	5	5.7%
7. Standardized interest inventory test scores.	1	3.2%	-	-	1	1.2%
8. Admission preference given to low enrollment program areas.	1	3.2%	-	-	1	1.2%
9. Degree of proficiency in the English language.	-	-	2	3.6%	2	2.3%
10. Ability to meet minimal physical performance levels or standards necessary to an occupational license or employment	2	6.5%	16	28.6%	18	20.77%
11. Minimum age requirements necessary to qualify for an occupational license or employment.	3	9.6%	6	10.7%	9	10.3%
TOTALS	31	100.0%	56	100.0%	87	100.0%

*These admission standards are additional to those required for institutional admission. Although specific to a range of different program areas, these data have been pooled for use in this report.

**Represents the summed total of institutional and program area responses.

Table 3

Items included on Part B (Initial Admission or Program Area Admission) and Part C (Admitted Students who are on Waiting Lists) on the Public Occupational Education Admission Equity Opinionnaire (POEAEO), Means ($\bar{x}$) and Standard Deviations for the Total Populations' Ratings on Each Item, and a Summary of the Degree of Equity Associated with the Items

Parts B and C Item Number	Item Description	Part B Total Population ($\bar{x}$)	Part B Total Population SD**	Part C Total Population ($\bar{x}$)	Part C Total Population SD**	Part B High Degree of Equity	Part B Low Degree of Equity	Part C High Degree of Equity	Part C Low Degree of Equity
*1.	Standardized aptitude test scores.	3.17	1.11	3.31	1.14	1		4***	
*2.	Previous overall grade point average.	3.11	1.22	3.21	1.24	3		3	
*3.	Individual interviews by counselors and/or instructors.	3.98	.96	3.98	.99	9***		9***	
*4.	Standardized achievement test scores.	3.07	1.06	3.11	1.08	1		1	
*5.	Existing geographic boundaries and/or sending school boundaries.	2.11	1.25	2.15	1.20		8***		8***
6.	Admission of an equal number of students from all sending schools.	2.11	1.27	2.02	1.21		7***		6***
7.	A lottery selection system for all admissions.	1.55	.97	1.57	.98		9***		9***
*8.	Recommendations by others.	2.71	1.25	2.78	1.29		2	1	
9.	Admission of a proportional number of students based on the size of each sending school's student population.	2.43	1.32	2.39	1.32		4***		5***
10.	The first students to apply will be the first students admitted.	3.03	1.44	3.17	1.49	5***	1	6***	1
*11.	Standardized interest inventory test scores.	2.94	1.10	2.92	1.17			1	
*12.	Admission preference given to low enrollment program areas.	2.43	1.03	2.48	1.18		4***		3
*13.	Degree of proficiency in the English Language.	2.96	1.12	2.95	1.19	1		1	
14.	Standardized intelligence test scores.	2.59	1.10	2.53	1.12		1		2
15.	Admission preference given to students who are women, minority group members, handicapped, or disadvantaged.	2.46	1.31	2.57	1.39	1	3	2	1
16.	Standardized work sample or performance test scores.	3.13	1.12	3.24	1.21	2		1	
*17.	Ability to meet minimal physical performance levels or standards necessary to an occupational license or employment.	3.79	1.18	3.70	1.25	8***		9***	
*18.	Minimum age requirements necessary to qualify for an occupational license or employment.	3.54	1.24	3.54	1.24	5***		4***	
19.	Standardized personality test scores.	2.26	1.09	2.29	1.14		4***		4

* Admission standards and practices which were identified on Phase I of this investigation.

** Unbiased estimates of population standard deviation.

*** Represents the upper or lower 20% of the items which were rated for their high degree of equity (4 and 5) or low degree of equity (1 and 2). A rating of 9 indicates that a particular item was included in the upper or lower 20% of the high degree of equity ratings (4 and 5) or low degree of equity ratings (1 and 2) by each of the 9 categorical groupings, which included the total population, AVTC's, CETA programs, community colleges, advisory councils, advocacy groups, administrators, counselors, and instructors. In instances where two or more items were tied for the fourth position which normally represents the upper or lower 20% all items were included.

Table 4

Range of Means (M) for the Total Population and Groups on the Items in Parts B and C of the Public Occupational Education Admission Equity Opinionnaire

Part B - Initial Admission or Program Area Admission

	Total Population	Institution or Affiliation (A1)					Title or Role Category (A2)		
		AVTC	CETA	CC	ADVISORY	ADVOCACY	ADMIN	COUNS	INSTR
Low Item	1.55 (B7)	1.52 (B7)	1.44 (B7)	1.78 (B7,B19)	1.33 (B7)	1.64 (B9)	1.58 (B7)	2.29 (B7)	1.36 (B7)
High Item	3.98 (B3)	4.03 (B3)	4.22 B3)	3.94 (B17,B18)	3.89 (B17)	4.25 (B3)	3.91 (B3)	4.07 (B17)	4.22 (B3)

Part C - Admitted Students Who Are on Waiting Lists

	Total Population	Institution or Affiliation					Title or Role Category		
		AVTC	CETA	CC	ADVISORY	ADVOCACY	ADMIN	COUNS	INSTR
Low Item	1.57 (C7)	1.57 (C7)	1.33 (C7)	1.72 (C6)	1.41 (C7)	1.42 (C7)	1.72 (C7)	2.00 (C6,C7)	1.31 (C7)
High Item	3.98 (C3)	3.98 (C3)	3.78 (C3)	4.06 (C18)	3.94 (C3)	4.17 (C3)	3.94 (C3)	4.00 (C3)	4.03 (C3)

Table 5

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on Repeated Measures Applied to the Responses of the Total Population on the 19 Items in Part B (Initial or Program Area Admission) and Part C (Admitted Students Who Are On Waiting Lists) on the Public Occupational Education Admission Equity Opinionnaire

Institution or Affiliation (A1) - Part B					
Source	df	SS	MS	F ratio	Significance
Among Groups	4	24.11	6.03	1.50	.21
Error	163	656.17	4.03		
Among Items	18	485.06	26.95	22.40	.00
Interaction (Item*Group)	72	134.55	1.87	1.55	.00
Error	2934	3530.15	1.20		

Title or Role Category (A2) - Part B					
Source	df	SS	MS	F ratio	Significance
Among Groups	4	26.82	6.70	1.65	.16
Error	162	658.84	4.07		
Among Items	18	475.41	26.41	21.88	.00
Interaction (Item*Group)	72	110.30	1.53	1.27	.06
Error	2916	3520.07	1.21		

Institution or Affiliation (A1) - Part C					
Source	df	SS	MS	F ratio	Significance
Among Groups	4	29.21	7.30	1.37	.24
Error	163	866.29	5.31		
Among Items	18	508.98	28.28	22.99	.00
Interaction (Item*Group)	72	120.56	1.67	1.36	.02
Error	2934	3608.06	1.23		

Title or Role Category (A2) - Part C					
Source	df	SS	MS	F ratio	Significance
Among Groups	4	16.55	4.14	.76	.55
Error	162	879.18	5.43		
Among Items	18	500.44	27.80	22.44	.00
Interaction (Item*Group)	72	98.29	1.36	1.10	.26
Error	2916	3613.13	1.24		